MSC Exec's November 2ⁿᵈ, 2016 Online Meeting
MINUTES

1:00   Welcome to all .

        Roll Call:
        Jack Albrecht ____; Diane Anderson _X___; Wendy Campbell __X__; Roberta Gebhardt _X__;
        Sinda Puryer __X___; Kelly Reisig _X__; Kathy Robins _X____; Mark Wetherington __X____;
        Debra Westrom __X___.

        MSL Reps: Jessie Goodwin __X____; Tracy Cook __X____; Bobbi deMontigny ____;
        Jemma Hazen; _X___ Amy Marchwick ____; Jennie Stapp _____.

        Guests:

Minutes from the Exec Board Meeting October 5ᵗʰ, 2016 – **Action item – vote on approval of minutes**
* Kathy moved to accept the minutes – Deb seconded - passed

Minutes from the Fall Members Meeting October 6ᵗʰ, 2016– **Action item – vote on approval of minutes**
* Please review the minutes, and let Kathy know if you see something that needs to be corrected

Minutes form the Exec Board Post Fall Members Meeting October 6ᵗʰ, 2016– **Action item – vote on approval of minutes**
* Kathy moved to accept the minutes – Diane seconded – passed

(Tracy will join us at 2:00)

1:10   Work Plan Update
* Wendy will send out the current project page to the membership and will update it as she gets responses from the membership. Jessie said that she will put the link on the Committees page. Sinda wanted to know if we could have the link under Committees and For Members. Jessie reminded us that they will be working on reorganizing the website. Diane said that she thinks new members might go to the For Members page first. Diane also wanted to know how hard it would be for the document to be updated. Jessie said it isn't hard to update the website. Diane suggested that we all contact our members monthly to see if we need to update the work plan. Discussion about updating the PowerPoint or changing to another format. Kathy suggested using a Google Form for libraries to submit their new projects. Diane and Wendy will work on a Google Form. Timeline shows that we will send out minutes to the member groups. Mark creates a synopsis of the minutes to send out to our groups.
* Deb asked if there are 2 school Google groups or just one. Diane explained that they will work together and whoever sees things first can share with the group and put both names on messages. Jessie showed us the list of Discussion Groups that are on the website.

1:25   Content Management Committee Update
* Jodie Moore from Red Lodge was not able to attend so Jemma will present the update. . CMC meets twice a year. They met in August and are gearing up for the Spring Meeting. Jodie and Stephan are compiling an agenda. Edits to the SCP are due to Jodie in early December. Discussion about catalog cleanup and deduping. They are waiting for

recommendations from the Ad Hoc Committee. They will begin looking at survey results. They want to share the survey results with the membership. Jemma is starting a pilot of Bib record audits. Winter webinars will be happening in January with Bobbi and members of the CMC. They will be explaining different portions of the SCP for the membership. CMC has asked that if the Executive Board has items to present to get them to Jodie soon for the March agenda.

1:40   Ad Hoc Committee for Cooperative Cataloging
   o   Since the membership meeting the committee met twice; October 18 and November 1. The group looked over the survey and had a good discussion about the results. At the November 1 meeting they came up with 3 ideas that the committee will look over and flesh out before the next meeting. Final meeting will be in early December. Kathy gave an overview of the reason this committee came into being. She talked about the Technical Services Summit and the concern about cataloging throughout the State of Montana. The committee has conducted interviews with several other consortia. Kathy went over the statistics that she pulled out for her written report. See attached. Kathy talked about the backlog of 1,100 items reported. The committee followed up with libraries on these titles. Of the 49 titles reported, about half of them were found in OCLC or the MSC. This brought up a discussion on the committee about training. Proposals will be presented that focus on training, better records and accountability. Jessie thanked Kathy for leading this committee.

1:55   Online Payments for Patrons
   o   Kathy asked if there is any way that we could get on-line payment for patrons. Jessie investigated this with other consortia. Kathy mentioned that patrons can't make payments from home and are sometimes blocked from downloading because they have fines. ProPay is SD's preferred provider. Some are using PayPal. Billings is looking into PayPal. They have worked with the city administrator to make sure it was OK. They want patrons to be able to pay their fine and update their account within Workflows. Jessie said BlueCloud Commerce will not work because all payments go to a central office and then paid out to libraries from there. Billings is trying this out.

         SirsiDynix Library Connections Video
   o   Jessie showed us the video. This can be used by anyone for marketing purposes. https://vimeo.com/183856435 Sinda mentioned a comment that Carrie Nelson had made suggesting that at the bottom of the check-out slip it read "You saved X $ today". This is a great marketing tool as well.

2:00   Discuss Cost Sharing Formula
   o   Jessie sent out cost sharing information from other consortia. See attached. She thinks that our formula is pretty easy and equitable. It is a good way to see how libraries are all funded differently thought the country. SAILS is the closest to ours. It is good to see what other groups are doing. MSC staff have been in research gathering mode. MobleCirc has been confirmed as a site wide license. Not feasible to split this out by library. No way to prevent libraries from sharing the code. It has to stay a site wide license at $5,600 a year. Investigated a GoToWebinar license for 100 seats costs $1,000 a year. We could save about $2,600 a year by going to one in person meeting and purchasing the license for one meeting a year. Started looking at how to create a flatter formula. MSL only has this data (operating budget) for public libraries. Would need to get the info for Academics, Specials and Schools.

Not sure that metrics used by publics can translate to other library types. Jessie did pull the public library data and looked at what 2% of their operating budget would look like. Mechanisms are not in place to collect this data for these other libraries. Jessie is not sure that we could even create the mechanisms to get this data for this next year. Wendy brought up how hard this would be to figure out for schools. Diane asked if any of the consortia that responded were multi-type. CCS is all public, OCLN is public and academic, SAILS is multi-type, Mid York is all public. Kathy brought up that from the Ad Hoc Committee interviews we found that several of the consortia have larger staffs and that is why some of the costs are higher. Jessie is looking at Mark's idea of keeping everyone where they are now and then adding in a certain percentage of patrons. Jessie and Tracy will work on a new cost sharing formula but feel that January is more realistic for some kind of new cost sharing formula.

Server location is a cost consideration for the budget. Jessie had actual numbers. Three scenarios

1. Hosting at State Data Center - $7,000 a year, membership cost, server is reaching end of life and will need to be replaced. Cost of new server is about $15,000 and must be replaced every 5 years. There are questions on if we can even maintain our own server
2. Virtualizing the server – no cost to membership, MSL would absorb ($3,000 a year). Decrease costs because we wouldn't have to buy a physical server. If we have to migrate from Oracle to MSQL we can't do it. Mike concerned about how Workflows will run in a virtual environment. $6,000 for Oracle license. Still have to have someone manage the server and we need a stable environment.
3. Hosted SaaS environment with SD. $12,000 in maintenance from SD. But there is a one-time migration fee of $16,750. We could get rid of the IBM contract so could save $12,000 a year and put that to the cost of SaaS maintenance.

Kathy asked if this $12,000 is contractual or if SD could raise the price. Jessie would like to lock it in for a number of years. Current contract we go up 2% a year. Kathy asked if there would be other savings going this way. Jessie said it would be time saving for staff. The SaaS team takes care of upgrades, etc. So staff can be freed up to work on other projects. When Mike retires we wouldn't have to replace him with someone who had as much server experience because SaaS would be taking care of that. Kathy mentioned that if we have to buy a new server we will be paying $15,000 so the migration cost of $16,750 isn't that much more. Diane is concerned about patron privacy with a virtual server. Jessie has been assured that it works the same way that our server does now so this shouldn't be a concern.

Changes to the cost share formula might need to be put on hold for a while longer. Kathy said that every little change can make a difference. Even if we go to one meeting a year we could save money for the MSC and for libraries that have to send folks to the meeting. Jessie said that this group also said that e-Library could go away which is a cost savings. Moving to one meeting a year will require a by-laws change. Kathy agrees that we should ask the membership for a by-laws change at the Spring Meeting. The GoToWebinar site license covers 100 seats. Roberta asked if we generally have more than 100 attendees. Jessie confirmed that we do not. She also suggested that some seats could be shared by libraries. Diane brought up that we might be violating our own by-laws if we only have 100 seats and have more than 100 voting members. Jessie will look to see if there is any wiggle

room on the 100 seats. Kathy suggested partnering with another group like MLA. Jessie will check with the vendor to see if that is allowed.

Jessie will be doing some preliminary work on the budget but needs to know where we are going with the server in order to start doing this. She does need to get a formal quote from SD too, if we want to go that way. Mike is working on testing the virtual server. He will probably try it with the Development Server. If testing the virtual server doesn't work, we don't have a no cost option. Mike is concerned about how many transactions are happening all the time and that a virtual server might not be able to handle it. Tracy said that they had been asked to test this because we had not heard from SD about SaaS.   Jessie will provide us with the three scenarios and points about each one. She will also look at cost over time. Jessie has spoken to CleveNet about this. They did not think a virtual server was a good idea. Other consortia that have moved to SaaS really like it. The Board would like Jessie to get a formal quote. Kelly will work with Jessie on the language of the by-laws change to move to one in-person meeting a year.

Mark had questions about when he should start working on the bullets to get out to the membership. He is suggesting that we look at the draft minutes and then the bullets. Sinda thinks we should have a time frame for when we need to get feedback back to the minute taker for corrections. The group decided on 10 days for getting the minutes out and getting feedback. Then the minutes and bullets can go out for feedback and we can have a link to send out to our libraries.

Next meeting January 4, 2017 at 1:00 pm.

2:30   Adjourn – **Action Item**
          Kathy moved to adjourn – Diane seconded. Meeting adjourned at 3:05.

Cooperative Cataloging Committee Report to the Executive Board – MSC – November 2, 2016

Scope of Committee:

1. Investigate current practices in cooperative cataloging in different libraries.
2. Discuss ideas and development of more robust cooperation among libraries while ensuring high quality records that adhere to MSC cataloging standards.
3. Propose solutions that will decrease the amount of time materials are unavailable because of a backlog of cataloging. Do we ask user sharing groups to pilot the idea?

Survey information:

- 73% of respondents are not comfortable creating an original record using Connexion.
- 62% of respondents wish someone else would do original cataloging for them. However, 74% say they would not consider paying to have these items cataloged by someone else. Of course, that leaves 26% who say they would pay for this.
- 53% of cataloging staff attended in-person MSC training in the past year and 70% attended an MSC webinar this year.
- About 7% of libraries currently purchase MARC records from a vendor and 4% say they plan to, leaving 89% saying they do not plan to purchase vendor records.
- 58% of libraries say they have a backlog of items to catalog.

2 issues persist:

1. Training
2. Catalog Cleanup

Proposals will be complete in December – most likely focused on these areas:

- Training
- Better records
- Accountability

CCS, Cooperative Computer Services

Our cost sharing formula changes depending on the source of the cost:

* ILS hardware & software maintenance: It seems our contract specifies a certain number of "user licenses", so the monthly bill is first divided by the total number of licenses, and then each library's portion is then calculated by multiplying that result by the number of licenses assigned to that library.

* OCLC: Each library gets billed a flat rate by the local OCLC network (ILLINET). The OCLC bills for each library are added together, then that total is then re-apportioned by us based on each library's relative materials budget; the libraries pay us, and we then pay ILLINET for them.

* Retrospective bibliographic conversions: Depends on the project, but for big ones, it's divided by the proportion of the bibliographic records to which each library has one or more copies attached.

* Pretty much everything else is simply divided equally by the number of members, though there are some cases where only libraries that use something pay for it (E.g. SIP2 licenses).

* New member libraries may qualify for graduated fees for the first three years if their operating budget is less than that of any existing member. For qualifying libraries, member fees are capped at 2.5% of their operating budget for the first year, 5.0% for the second year, and 7.5% for the third year, and are uncapped after that; some costs don't count towards that cap, such as SIP2 licenses & data migration costs. Existing members are not assessed additional amounts to subsidize the phase-in program; the remainder comes out of the consortium's operating fund & development fund.

Joel Hahn, Database Manager

Mid-York Library Consortium

We just went to a flat rate formula this year. Our previous model was complicated and based on the number of computers, patrons, circs, etc. The basic formula for assessment is 3.75% x library operating budget (reported by each library on the NYS Library Annual Report as "Total Operating Fund Disbursements", the line numbers below).

·   Line 12.5 Total Staff Expenditures

·   Line 12.9 Total Collection Expenditures

·   Line 12.17 Total Operation & Maintenance of Buildings

·   Line 12.24 Total Miscellaneous Expenses

The assessment is then reduced by the funds contributed by each County for each particular library.

Linda Manfredo, Automation Systems Administrator

SAILS Library Network

Listed below is our formula. All I can say is that it is okay. I haven't really seen one that works too well, particularly since at least in our case we can't have huge variations from year to year.

We take out total operating expenses minus any state grants or Erate discounts.

We take 25% of the remaining and divide that by voting members

We take 35% of the remaining and divide by total circulation for the previous year. That gives us a cost per circ transaction.

We take 35% of the remaining and divide by the total materials expenditures for the preivous year. That gives us a cost per circ transaction.

We take 5% of the remaining and come up with a fee based on the size of the telecommunications switch we provide to each library. So it comes out to a flat fee for libraries that 48 port switches, 24 port switches or 12 port switches.

Deborah Conrad, Executive Director

Old Colony Library Network

Our funding model / formula is quite complex.

We include the following data elements:
1. Number of Branches
2. Common charge (35% of the operating budget shared equally among all members)
3. Populations Charge
4. Equalized Valuation - a Massachusetts formula that ranks the relative wealth of cities and towns 5. # of Worflows stations 6. FTE Staff 7. Prior year Materials Budget 8. 5 year average circ 9. a credit for interlibrary lending within the consortia

Our members have a high degree of confidence in the formula, which is good. But at the same time they acknowledge that there are inequities - a slight shift in circulation or materials budget can skew things.

For instance, this year our budget increase will be a flat 3% but when the numbers are run through our formula, the members see wide swings in increases - ranging from an 8% increase to a reduction of 1%.

The OCLN Members will vote the budget next week but it looks like they'll vote to apply a flat increase to the assessment they paid last year, so each will increase by 3%. And I expect we will adopt that model moving forward.

David Slater, Executive Director